

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 7-11 are pending and have been rejected. Claims 7-11 have been amended to correct informalities in the claim language and to more clearly define the claimed subject matter.

Objection to the Specification

In the outstanding Office Action dated April 5, 2007, the Examiner objected to the Abstract. Applicants respectfully submit amendment to the Abstract to correct informalities.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 7-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-12, as amended, clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as invention.

In the above identified Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it is not clear whether receiving “data” is the input original data or the resultant data. The Examiner also asserts that it is not clear whether the resultant data is the converted data or the compressed data. Claims 7-11, as amended, now read “for receiving original data, the original data having been converted into a digital signal in predetermined sampling intervals, compressing the original data to generate the resultant data, and recording resultant data into a memory.” Thus, it is clear that the signal processing device receives original data, and that the original data had been converted into a digital signal. It is also clear that the resultant data is compressed data because the original data is compressed so as to create the resultant data.

In addition, it is noted that, as recited by the claims, the original data operated on by the signal processing device has already been converted into a digital signal having predetermined sampling intervals. As such, it is not necessary that the claimed device receive an analog signal and perform an A-to-D conversion process. However, it is clear that a device could include such additional circuitry if it was desirable to do so.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would fully understand the scope of the invention as set forth in the claims when reading the claims in light of the specification. As nothing more is required in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, claims 7-12, as amended, are clear and unambiguous and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CONCLUSION

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:mjb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: June 18, 2007
DC99 1402296-1.071971.0608